

May 31, 2002

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** United States Department of Education  
Larry Wexler, Deputy Director  
Monitoring and State Improvement Planning Division

**FROM:** Jacquelyn J. Thompson, Ph.D., Director

**SUBJECT:** Biennial Performance Report for Part B of the  
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Enclosed is the original plus three (3) copies of the Michigan Biennial Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Questions regarding this report can be directed to me at (517) 373-9433 [thompsonjj@mi.gov](mailto:thompsonjj@mi.gov) or Karen Rockhold at (517) 335-0444 [rockholdk@mi.gov](mailto:rockholdk@mi.gov).

We view the Biennial Performance Report as a key element in the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process. The report reflects the relationship of performance data to ongoing improvement planning.

Enclosures (4)

**State of Michigan**  
**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**  
**For the Period July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2001**

**Introduction: The Context for the Biennial Performance Report**

**Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process:**

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE/EIS), has undertaken many efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. The MDE is in the second year of its Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP). In 2000-2001, the MDE completed its self-assessment for both Part C and Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Following the submission of the self-assessment report, the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) provided guidance to the MDE regarding the emphasis of CIMP work in 2001-2002. CIMP activities undertaken during this year include: (1) The identification of desired results and corresponding indicators and (2) improvement planning, including root cause analysis, of areas of immediate concern discovered through self-assessment. The areas of immediate concern for Part B center on general supervision (complaints, hearings and mediation). These areas have received the attention of the MDE staff and the CIMP Steering Committee in this year. The CIMP Steering Committee will dig deeply into the issues surrounding participation and performance on statewide assessment, graduation of students with disabilities, dropout rates, and suspension and expulsion as they conduct root cause analysis related to the Result Area: *Students with disabilities reach challenging educational standards*. This Result Area, as well as others, will be addressed in the 2002-2003 CIMP agenda.

In order to meet the reporting requirements for the Biennial Performance Report, as well as honor the work of the CIMP Steering Committee, the Michigan CIMP Result Area: *Students with disabilities reach challenging educational standards* serves as the goal statement for the Performance Report. Participation and performance on statewide assessment, graduation rates, dropout rates, and suspension and expulsion rates serve as indicators of Michigan's success in meeting this goal.

## **Data Collection and Reporting Status**

### Michigan Educational Assessment System

The Michigan State Board of Education adopted a policy regarding the Michigan Educational Assessment System (MEAS) in 2001. This policy states that school districts must ensure that all students participate in the MEAS using the appropriate statewide assessment. The components of the statewide assessment system are Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP), MI-Access (the alternate assessment for students with disabilities for whom the MEAP is not appropriate) and ELL-Access for English Language Learners.

### Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

The MEAP is Michigan's statewide general education assessment. The administrative functions of the MEAP office moved from the Michigan Department of Education to the Michigan Department of Treasury by Executive Order. Coordination difficulties have occurred during the transition resulting in incomplete MEAP assessment data for students with disabilities for 2000-2001. This data deficit will be addressed through an interagency agreement between the Michigan Department of Education and the Michigan Department of Treasury. This agreement is currently under discussion.

Participation in the MEAP by students with disabilities is improving. It is interesting to note that while overall MEAP participation has increased, a smaller number of students scored within the satisfactory or proficient range. It remains to be seen whether this is due to increased participation of students with disabilities or to other factors.

### Center for Education Performance Information (CEPI)

The Center for Education Performance Information (CEPI) was created through Executive Order to be the sole repository of data reported by public schools in Michigan. It is now housed within the Office of State Budget, Michigan Department of Management and Budget. The initial two years of this new model have been challenged by system design and infrastructure development. As a result, some data, most notably graduation and drop out rates, suspension and expulsion data are flawed. It is anticipated that updated interagency memoranda of understanding and improved working relationships will significantly improve the quality of the data management through CEPI.

The MDE continues to support school districts' compliance information management capacity through the emerging Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS), with ongoing technical assistance, training, and on-line help.

### Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS):

The MDE, OSE/EIS, is in the midst of a substantial compliance information system upgrade. Many of the data collection and reporting difficulties reported in the past are still reflected in the 2000-2001 data. These data will improve as the MI-CIS information management system is implemented. As a result, performance targets and benchmarks reflect both data improvements and student performance improvements.

The statewide reporting of suspension and expulsion data was especially problematic for the Michigan Department of Education in 2000-20001. The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services collected a reasonable count of suspensions in 1999-2000. That count was approximately 1500 students. For SY 2000-2001 the OSE/EIS was not permitted to collect or assist in the collection of these data (the former CEPI Director required that the data be collected through SRSD exclusively, without input from the MDE), resulting in a very incomplete data set. For the current year, this has been addressed through combined efforts of CEPI and the MDE and will result in a more accurate data set.

### **Standards for Accreditation**

At its March 2002 meeting the Michigan State Board of Education approved Education Yes! – A Yardstick for Excellent Schools in accordance with section 1280 of the Revised School Code and under its authority in Article VIII, Section 3 of the Michigan Constitution.

Michigan's school accreditation system is based on standards that focus on every school working with every student. Measures of school performance and measures of student achievement are the foundation of this system. Student achievement will include the following measures:

- achievement status to measure how well a school is doing in educating all students
- achievement change to measure whether student achievement is improving or declining
- achievement growth to measure whether students are receiving at least one year of academic growth for each year of instruction

All data will be disaggregated per No Child Left Behind of 2001, including reporting on the achievement of students with disabilities. Michigan's school accreditation system will report to school districts, school buildings, and to the public. The first reports are scheduled for December 2002.

TABLE 1

State of \_\_\_\_\_

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<p>Goal 1: Michigan Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) Result Area: Students with disabilities reach challenging educational standards.</p> <p>The State of Michigan Board of Education priority: Raise Student Achievement in Michigan. *</p>		
<p>Goal 1/Indicator A: (SECTION 1 – PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS)</p> <p><u>Indicator of success:</u></p> <p>Participation of students with disabilities in Michigan's statewide assessment increases.</p>		<p>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator A:</p> <p><u>Performance Target:</u></p> <p>By December 2005, 100% of students with disabilities will participate in Michigan's statewide assessment system.</p> <p><u>Benchmarks:</u></p> <p>By December 2002, Education Yes! (See Attachment A) will include these data as part of the accreditation system for schools.</p> <p>By May 2003, the CIMP Steering Committee will have set strategic directives for this goal.</p> <p>By December 2003, assessment participation rates will be reported through MI-CIS data portraits for every school district.</p>
<p>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator A: 2000-2001 INCOMPLETE DATA.</p> <p>Known MEAP participation rates for students with disabilities:</p>		
Grade Level	Test	Participation Rate
4 <sup>th</sup>	Reading	45.30%
4 <sup>th</sup>	Math	47.04%
5 <sup>th</sup>	Science	52.82%
5 <sup>th</sup>	Social Studies	51.87%
5 <sup>th</sup>	Writing	49.43%
8 <sup>th</sup>	Science	60.58%
8 <sup>th</sup>	Social Studies	62.37%
8 <sup>th</sup>	Writing	62.48%

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator A Performance Data:

Data:

- Participation rates for students with disabilities in the MEAP are improving. The major improvement is in participation rates for grade 8. Compared with 1999 data, participation increased from 52.02% to 60.58% in science; from 48.03% to 62.37% in social studies; and from 49.37% to 62.48% in writing. Grade 4 participation in reading and math have remained about the same. Reading participation was 45.64% in 1999 and is 45.30% in 2000. Math participation was 45.79% in 1999 and is 47.04% in 2000. Grade 5 participation in science, social studies and writing also remained about the same as 1999 rates of participation. Science participation was 52.02% in 1999 and is 52.82% in 2000. Social Studies rate was 48.03% in 1999 and is 51.87% in 2000. Writing participation rate was 49.37% in 1999 and is 49.43% in 2000.
- Missing data include 7<sup>th</sup> grade reading and mathematics special education state summary reports and grade 11 reports. The MEAP office will produce grade 7 reports. Grade 11 reports are now produced when the entire cohort graduates. Furthermore, the MEAP office database did not include a field that identifies the student as being in special education, therefore no high school reports disaggregated by special education are being produced. This data deficit will be addressed through an interagency agreement with the Department of Treasury (location of state assessment office)
- The MEAP office is NOT in the Michigan Department of Education; the Michigan Department of Education does not have direct control of the reports produced by the MEAP office.
- Alternate Assessment (MI-Access) data are due to be reported in the districts August 2002. These data will be submitted to the OSEP as soon as they are available. IEP teams determine participation in alternate assessment for students with disabilities for whom MEAP or Level 1 MI-Access are not appropriate. These data are not aggregated.
- The contractor for the development and implementation of the alternate assessment for Michigan (MI-Access) is separate from the contractor for the development and management of the MEAP. Changes in existing contracts will be necessary to align reporting dates and add fields to databases for additional information.

Policy:

- During the 2000-2001 school year the state had a policy in place that allowed parent exemptions from the general state assessments (MEAP). A new policy has been adopted by the Michigan State Board of Education on October 18, 2001 requiring districts to ensure that all students are assessed with the appropriate state assessment in the Michigan Educational Assessment System (See Attachment B). The three state assessments are the MEAP, MI-Access or ELL-Access.

Response to BPR Questions (Step 5 of Assessment Instructions):

**1. Does the State have policy that allows a parent to “exempt” his/her child from State or district-wide assessments?**

The Michigan State Board of Education approved the Michigan Educational Assessment System (MEAS) October 2001 (See attachment 1). This policy states districts must ensure that all students participate in the MEAS using the appropriate assessment. Prior to the 2001/2002 school year, parents of students with disabilities and Limited English Proficient students had the option to exempt their child from the state assessments. This is no longer a state policy. The state however cannot prevent parents from refusing to have their child participate in the state assessment system.

**2. When statistically sound, has the State defined performance levels for the Alternate Assessment?**

Yes. MI-Access has defined three categories of performance, Surpassed the Performance Standard, and Attained the Performance Standard and Emerging Toward the Performance Standard.

**3. Does a single alternate assessment represent multiple content areas, or are there separate alternate assessments for each content area?**

The Phase 1 MI-Access assessments, Participation and Supported Independence, cover multiple content areas. They are developed for ages comparable to the general state assessment grades assessed (ages 9, 10, 13, 14, 17 and 18). Ages 11 and 12 will be in place by the 2005/2006 school year. MI-Access Participation is designed for students with severe cognitive impairment or those who function as if they have such impairment. Supported Independence is designed for students with moderate cognitive impairment or those who function as if they have such impairment. The assessment design for both of these assessments does not include sufficient numbers of “items” to report results by specific content areas. Consequently, MI-Access results are reported by broad areas called performance expectations.

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

The Phase 2 MI-Access assessments are in the process of being developed for students for whom the MEAP, MEAP with assessment accommodations, MI-Access Participation or MI-Access Supported Independence are not appropriate. These assessments will be developed at the same grade levels as the general state assessment (grades 3,4, 5, 6 7, 8, and 11). There will be multiple Phase 2 assessments for IEP Teams to choose from. There will be MI-Access English Language Arts/Reading, MI-Access Mathematics, and MI-Access Functional Independence assessments. Also, starting in the 2007/2008 school year there will be a MI-Access science assessment. By including multiple assessment options it provides IEP Teams with appropriate options for all students with disabilities.

**4. How does the exclusion/exemption rate for students with disabilities compare to that for students who are non-disabled?**

Since the state board policy does not provide for parent exemption this data is not available. For the 2001/2002 school year the MEAP and MI-Access student scan sheets did not include a "Parent Exempt" bubble. If a parent refuses to have his/her child assessed the "Not Tested" bubble is filled in. This bubble also is filled in when a child is absent, or the student is randomly marking answers on the scan sheet.

**5. How does the state identify students with disabilities who are participating in statewide assessments?**

A scan form should be completed for all public school students in Michigan, either a MEAP or a MI-Access scan document. MI-Access will be producing participation rate reports in order to calculate the number of students participating in alternate assessment. Each district and school building will receive these reports. The Michigan Department of Education will also be providing data to the Michigan Department of Treasury, (where the general state assessment is housed, in electronic format. Using the MI-Access report and the MEAP reports a total percentage of students participating in state assessment will be able to be calculated.

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<p>Goal 1/Indicator B: (SECTION 1.1 PARTICIPATION IN AND PERFORMANCE ON ASSESSMENT)</p> <p><u>Indicator of success:</u></p> <p>The performance of students with disabilities on state-assessments improves.</p>	<p>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator B:</p> <p><u>Performance Target:</u></p> <p>By December 2005, the performance of <u>all</u> students with disabilities will be known, so that appropriate technical assistance can be provided statewide.</p> <p><u>Benchmarks:</u></p> <p>By December 2002, Education Yes! will include these data as part of the accreditation system for schools.</p> <p>By May 2003, the CIMP Steering Committee will have set strategic directives for this goal.</p> <p>By December 2003, assessment performance will be reported through MI-CIS data portraits for every school district.</p>
<p>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator B: 2000-2001 INCOMPLETE DATA. See Table 1B for MEAP Performance data from available reports.</p>	
<p>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator B Performance Data:</p> <p><u>Data:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Missing data include 7<sup>th</sup> grade reading and mathematics special education state summary reports and grade 11 reports. The MEAP office will produce grade 7 reports. Grade 11 reports are now produced when the entire cohort graduates. Furthermore, the MEAP office database did not include a field that identifies the student as being in special education, therefore no high school reports disaggregated by special education are being produced. These issues are being addressed with the MEAP office and will be corrected through an interagency memorandum of understanding.</li> <li>The MEAP office is NOT in the Michigan Department of Education therefore the Michigan Department of Education does not have direct control of the reports produced by the MEAP office. The Office of Special Education and Early intervention Services continues to inform the MEAP office of federal reporting requirements.</li> <li>Alternate Assessment data are not yet available. Reports are due to be reported in the districts August 2002. These data will be submitted to the OSEP as soon as they are available. IEP teams determine participation in alternate assessment for students with disabilities for whom MEAP or Level 1 MI-Access are not appropriate. These data are not aggregated.</li> </ul> <p><u>Policy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the 2000-2001 school year the state had a policy in place that allowed parent exemptions from the general state assessments (MEAP). A new policy has been adopted by the Michigan State Board of Education requiring districts to ensure that all students are assessed with the appropriate state assessment in the Michigan Educational Assessment System (see attached policy). The three state assessments are the MEAP, MI-Access or ELL-Access.</li> </ul>	



## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<p>Goal 1/Indicator C: (SECTION 1.2 DROPOUT RATES)</p> <p><u>Indicator of success:</u></p> <p>Drop out rates for students with disabilities decrease. *</p>	<p>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator C:</p> <p><u>Performance target:</u></p> <p>By December 2005, the drop out rate data for students with disabilities will be comparable to general education drop out rate data.</p> <p><u>Benchmarks:</u></p> <p>By December 2002, Education Yes! will include these data as part of the accreditation system for schools.</p> <p>By May 2003, the CIMP Steering Committee will have set strategic directives for this goal.</p> <p>By December 2003, drop out data will be reported through MI-CIS data portraits for every school district.</p> <p>By December 2003, the consistency of reporting exit data across the state will be audited/monitored.</p>
<p>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator C: 2000-2001</p> <p>31.5% of students with disabilities are reported as dropouts.</p>	
<p>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator C Performance Data:</p> <p><u>Data:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a one-year calculation based on Federal table 4, Section B, page 13 (of 14), looking at students with disabilities aged 16 through 22 who are reported as dropouts.</li> <li>The MDE's special education compliance database is undergoing revision. In the future we will be able to track most students over time through the use of a statewide Student Unique Identifier, allowing for a more accurate calculation. Currently, there are students in the "Moved, Not known to be continuing" category that cannot be tracked over time and across the state. They are not counted as dropouts in this calculation. The new data system will allow for more accurate reporting on the status of those students.</li> <li>The calculation differs from the methodology used in general education. The Standard and Poor's Statewide Insights document reports "Although different states calculate dropout rates differently, Michigan's dropout formula is so different that the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) does not compare Michigan's dropout data with the rest of the nation's." (Pg. 33). Currently, a complex retention rate calculation is used.</li> </ul> <p><u>Policy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Michigan School Code and state policy contains a preference for the "normal" and "alternative" (as opposed to "adult") education secondary school sequence for school age dropouts.</li> <li>School age dropouts must be out of school for one year before enrollment is allowed in adult education</li> <li>School age dropouts under age 16 cannot be claimed for state school aid when attending adult education programs.</li> <li>Students who have dropped out may enroll without resident district permission in a district other than the district of residence that operates alternative education programs for more than 1 district.</li> <li>The school code requires that each district or public school academy submit data needed to calculate annual dropout rates.</li> <li>Alternative education most often cited in law in conjunction with suspension/expulsion State must inventory alternative education options across districts and provide technical assistance Some additional flexibility in statute for waiving minimum days/hours of instruction in alternative education programs</li> <li>Education YES! - The New Michigan State Board of Education Standards-based Accreditation System for Schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dropout rates are a direct factor used in determining a rating score for each school</li> <li>All Michigan high school students will have a 4-year education and employment development plan leading them to being prepared for success</li> </ul> </li> <li>Michigan Department of Career Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports for dropouts are also available through the Michigan Department of Career Development (MDCD), a state agency that is distinct from the Michigan Department of Education.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Performance Goals and Indicators**

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

MDCD must make available, under Section 121 of the Workforce Investment Act Of 1998 (P.L. 105-220), a listing of all school dropout, postsecondary, and adult programs assisted under the Perkins Act. Many of the resources and services provided through MDCD and Michigan Rehabilitation Services (MRS) can be accessed at the more than 100 Michigan Works! service centers throughout the state.

- Michigan Departments of Education and Career Development/Rehabilitation Services Cash-Match Programs

There are approximately 70 jointly funded and operated programs implemented by school districts and the Michigan Rehabilitation Services office of MDCD under cash-match grants.

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<p>Goal 1/Indicator D: (SECTION 1.3 GRADUATION RATES)</p> <p><u>Indicator of success:</u></p> <p>Graduation rates for students with disabilities increase. *</p>	<p>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator D:</p> <p><u>Performance target:</u></p> <p>By December 2005, 80% of students with disabilities will graduate from high school.</p> <p>By December 2005, data collection improvements phased in over a four-year period will result in improved methodology for the calculation of graduation rates.</p> <p><u>Benchmarks:</u></p> <p>By December 2002, Education Yes! will include these data as part of the accreditation system for schools.</p> <p>By May 2003, the CIMP Steering Committee will have set strategic directives for this goal.</p> <p>By December 2003, graduation rates will be reported through MI-CIS data portraits for every school district.</p>
<p>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator D: 2000-2001</p> <p>53.96% of students with disabilities (aged 18 and 19 years) are reported to graduate.</p>	
<p>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator D Performance Data:</p> <p><u>Data:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using a one-year calculation, taking data from Federal Table 4 Section B, Page 13 (of 14). Divide the number of graduations by the number of exits to get graduation rate. Used 18 and 19 year olds, although we do not know the mix of high school juniors and seniors in the breakdown.</li> <li>Comparison data for general education are problematic. Standard and Poor's Statewide Insights reports "Like the dropout rate, concerns exist over the method the state [Michigan] uses to calculate graduation rates".</li> <li>In special education data (December 1), we have an age data element, but not grade. So we are left with an estimate of grade which makes the four-year method difficult.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Even in using a one-year method, we have to make an age estimate for which students are about to graduate.</li> <li>Our annual snapshot counts do not track children from year to year. We do get a count of the number of children that left in the last year, but we have an incomplete record of transfers into another district or state.</li> <li>Even when we are able to track special education children from year to year, we have no mechanism for tracking children who leave special education and then graduate from general education. The 'no longer special education' category is excluded from the graduation rate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Single Record Student Database (general education data collection system) collects exit reason data for all students. Their set of codes is much larger, including many levels of graduation and certificates.</li> </ul> <p><u>Policy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In regard to graduation standards, Michigan is a local control state, with over 550 locally elected school boards, 57 Intermediate School Boards (ISD), and 191 charter school boards. In general, the state attempts to influence school performance by providing incentives for bottom-line performance on statewide testing which is aligned with Michigan Curriculum Framework Standards/Benchmarks and other performance indicators, while avoiding intrusion in local decisions regarding curriculum and instruction. Requirements vary dramatically.</li> </ul>	

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

- The State of Michigan does not:
  - grant a diploma leaving that authority and responsibility to local education agencies/boards (exception: State School for the Deaf)
  - grant various certificates of attainment that are alternatives to a regular diploma, e.g., certificates of attendance or completion
  - have a state-standardized test students must pass in order to graduate (e.g., Regents Test in NY)
  - recognize a GED as equivalent to a regular diploma, i.e., attainment of a GED does not terminate a student's right to a FAPE for the purposes of pursuing a regular diploma; however GED's are accepted for college admission
- State education statutes and regulations do assign local boards of education the authority and responsibility to:
  - determine curriculum that is reasonably within a broadly based state curriculum framework, i.e., there is no single detailed and mandated state curriculum for students in general or special education
  - at local board's discretion, grant diplomas strictly according to locally determined general standards
  - Alternatively, at a local board's discretion, approve all local curricula as a single combined "general" curriculum for graduation. In this case, by local definition, all students regardless of level of functioning would be "in the general curriculum" or would require a subjective distinction between what is 'general' and 'special' curriculum
  - at local boards' discretion, approve local curricular elements covering all students via separate "general" and "special" curricula
  - at the local board's discretion, also allow graduation by standards outlined on an IEP as determined by an IEPT
  - at local board's discretion, grant various certificates of attainment that are not a regular diploma
- Graduation with a regular diploma may be indicative of local operational procedures and definitions, rather than measures of attainment.
- Transition is a uniquely significant issue in Michigan that may impact graduation. Nationally, Michigan has the broadest age range for special education, providing a FAPE to eligible students who are age 25 or less at the beginning of the school year.
  - Students/parents may seek to delay completion of graduation requirements in order to continue mandated services via an IEP. This in turn may delay pursuing services from other community agencies.
  - "Late completers" may present complications in determining yearly graduation rates

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<p>Goal 1/Indicator E: (SECTION 2 –SUSPENSION AND EXPULSION)</p> <p><u>Indicator of Success:</u></p> <p>Suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities will be accurately reported.</p>	<p>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator E:</p> <p><u>Performance Target:</u> By December 2003, the State of Michigan will have an adequate baseline of reliable data regarding suspension and expulsion so that an appropriate performance target can be set.</p> <p><u>Benchmarks :</u></p> <p>By December 2002, data collection improvements will result in accurate initial collection of data.</p> <p>By December 2003, data combined with 2002 baseline will allow CIMP Steering Committee to set a meaningful performance target.</p> <p>By December 2003, incident based data collection begins.</p>
<p>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator E: 2000-2001 306 students with disabilities were reported as suspended or expelled</p>	
<p>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator E Performance Data:</p> <p><u>Data:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suspension and expulsion data was taken from Federal Table 5, Section B, Page 3 (of 4).</li> <li>• These data are deeply flawed, due to collection errors described in the introduction to this report.</li> <li>• In the future, the OSE/EIS will collect these data on an incident basis.</li> </ul> <p><u>Policy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Michigan Revised Rules for Special Education and the Michigan School Code are relatively silent on detailed provisions regarding suspension for students with disabilities. Typically, general discipline procedures are provided in state law and policy with the clause that they are to be implemented without violating any due process provisions under state or federal law for special education students. Since state law and policy addressing discipline and special education are scant, the resulting guidance from the state is for discipline implemented per general state procedures without violating the federal regulations for the IDEA at 34 CFR §§300.519 et seq.</li> <li>• Consistent with findings of the most recent Government Accounting Office study (Student Discipline: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, January 2001) LEA policies and procedures may differ from federal regulations, and their connection with due process rights often raise significant issues requiring technical assistance for the appropriate administration of discipline.</li> <li>• In general, it is the position of the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services that positive behavior support (PBS) approaches be used if at all possible. This position is supported by Michigan's State Improvement Grant (SIG).</li> <li>• Also note that other connections to discipline are mentioned in this report in sections addressing the provision of alternative education, a topic frequently cast in the context of discipline issues.</li> </ul> <p>Key provisions in state law and policy are: School Code, 380.1311 – Covers: (1) suspension/expulsion for gross misdemeanor or persistent disobedience. " If there is reasonable cause to believe that the pupil is handicapped, and the school district has not evaluated the pupil in accordance with rules of the state board to determine if the student is handicapped, the pupil shall be evaluated immediately by the intermediate school district of which the school district is constituent in accordance with section 1711"; (2) provisions for weapons, arson and criminal sexual conduct, (3) suspension/expulsion is from all schools in the state for behavior related to (2), (4) referral to county social services or community health for behavior related to (2), (5) petition to reinstate after expulsion for behavior related to (2), (9 &amp; 10) enrollment in</p>	

**Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Goals and Indicators**

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

alternative education. There is no mention of disability except for (8) which states "This section does not diminish the due process rights under federal law of a pupil who has been determined to be eligible for special education programs and services".

School Code, 380.1311a – Contains parallel language covering physical or verbal assault (as defined by the district). (8) this section is identical to (8) given above for 380.1311.

School Code, 380.1311g – Describes students served by a strict discipline academy:

- (3) A strict discipline academy shall be established under sections 1311b to 1311l specifically for enrolling 1 or more of the following types of pupils:
  - (a) Pupils placed in the strict discipline academy by a court or by the family independence agency or a county juvenile agency under the direction of a court.
  - (b) Pupils who have been expelled under section 1311(2).
  - (c) Pupils who have been expelled under section 1311a or another provision of this act.
  - (d) Other expelled pupils referred to the strict discipline academy by that pupil's school and placed in the strict discipline academy by the pupil's parent or legal guardian.
- (4) In addition to the types of pupils specified in section (3), a strict discipline public school academy shall be open for enrollment of a special education pupil who does not meet the requirements of subsection (3) if the special education pupil's individualized educational planning committee recommends that the special education pupil be placed in the strict discipline public school academy.

Enter the percentage of the total performance goals established for students with disabilities that are consistent with those for nondisabled students. \_\_\_\_\_100\_\_\_\_\_ %

TABLE 1

State of \_\_\_\_\_

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 1:</b> Michigan Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) Result Area: <b>Students with disabilities reach challenging educational standards.</b>  The State of Michigan Board of Education priority: Raise Student Achievement in Michigan.	
<b>Goal 1/Indicator A: (SECTION 1.3 GRADUATION RATES)</b> Indicator of success:  Graduation rates for students with disabilities increase *	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator A:</b>  <u>Performance target:</u>  By December 2005, 80% of students with disabilities will graduate from high school.  By December 2005, data collection improvements phased in over a four-year period will result in improved methodology for the calculation of graduation rates.  <u>Benchmarks:</u>  By December 2002, Education Yes! will include these data as part of the accreditation system for schools.  By May 2003, the CIMP Steering Committee will have set strategic directives for this goal.  By December 2003, graduation rates will be reported through MI-CIS data portraits for every school district.
<b>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b> 53.96% of students with disabilities (aged 18 and 19 years) are reported to graduate.	
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator A Performance Data:</b> <u>Data:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using a one-year calculation, taking data from Federal Table 4 Section B, Page 13 (of 14). Divide the number of graduations by the number of exits to get graduation rate. Used 18 and 19 year olds, although we do not know the mix of high school juniors and seniors in the breakdown.</li> <li>Comparison data for general education are problematic. Standard and Poor's Statewide Insights reports "Like the dropout rate, concerns exist over the method the state [Michigan] uses to calculate graduation rates".</li> <li>In special education data (December 1), we have an age data element, but not grade. So we are left with an estimate of grade which makes the four-year method difficult. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Even in using a one-year method, we have to make an age estimate for which students are about to graduate.</li> <li>Our annual snapshot counts do not track children from year to year. We do get a count of the number of children that left in the last year, but we have an incomplete record of transfers into another district or state.</li> <li>Even when we are able to track special education children from year to year, we have no mechanism for tracking children who leave special education and then graduate from general education. The 'no longer special education' category is excluded from the graduation rate.</li> <li>The Single Record Student Database (general education data collection system) collects exit reason data for all students. Their set of codes is much larger, including many levels of graduation and certificates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

Policy:

- In regard to graduation standards, Michigan is a local control state, with over 550 locally elected school boards, 57 Intermediate School Boards (ISD), and 191 charter school boards. In general, the state attempts to influence school performance by providing incentives for bottom-line performance on statewide testing which is aligned with Michigan Curriculum Framework Standards/Benchmarks and other performance indicators, while avoiding intrusion in local decisions regarding curriculum and instruction. Requirements vary dramatically.
- The State of Michigan does not:
  - grant a diploma leaving that authority and responsibility to local education agencies/boards (exception: State School for the Deaf)
  - grant various certificates of attainment that are alternatives to a regular diploma, e.g., certificates of attendance or completion
  - have a state-standardized test students must pass in order to graduate (e.g., Regents Test in NY)
  - recognize a GED as equivalent to a regular diploma, i.e., attainment of a GED does not terminate a student's right to a FAPE for the purposes of pursuing a regular diploma; however GED's are accepted for college admission
- State education statutes and regulations do assign local boards of education the authority and responsibility to:
  - determine curriculum that is reasonably within a broadly based state curriculum framework, i.e., there is no single detailed and mandated state curriculum for students in general or special education
  - at local board's discretion, grant diplomas strictly according to locally determined general standards
  - Alternatively, at a local board's discretion, approve all local curricula as a single combined "general" curriculum for graduation. In this case, by local definition, all students regardless of level of functioning would be "in the general curriculum" or would require a subjective distinction between what is 'general' and 'special' curriculum
  - at local boards' discretion, approve local curricular elements covering all students via separate "general" and "special" curricula
  - at the local board's discretion, also allow graduation by standards outlined on an IEP as determined by an IEPT
  - at local board's discretion, grant various certificates of attainment that are not a regular diploma
- Graduation with a regular diploma may be indicative of local operational procedures and definitions, rather than measures of attainment.
- Transition is a uniquely significant issue in Michigan that may impact graduation. Nationally, Michigan has the broadest age range for special education, providing a FAPE to eligible students who are age 25 or less at the beginning of the school year.
  - Students/parents may seek to delay completion of graduation requirements in order to continue mandated services via an IEP. This in turn may delay pursuing services from other community agencies.
  - "Late completers" may present complications in determining yearly graduation rates

**Enter the percentage of the total performance goals established for students with disabilities that are consistent with those for nondisabled students. \_\_\_\_\_ 100 %**



TABLE 1

State of \_\_\_\_\_

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 1:</b> Michigan Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) Result Area: <b>Students with disabilities reach challenging educational standards.</b>	
The State of Michigan Board of Education priority: Raise Student Achievement in Michigan.	
<b>Goal 1/Indicator A: (SECTION 2- SUSPENSION AND EXPULSION)</b> Suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities will be accurately reported.	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator A:</b>  <u>Performance Target:</u> By December 2003, the State of Michigan will have an adequate baseline of reliable data regarding suspension and expulsion so that an appropriate performance target can be set.  <u>Benchmarks :</u>  By December 2002, data collection improvements will result in accurate initial collection of data.  By December 2003, data combined with 2002 baseline will allow CIMP Steering Committee to set a meaningful performance target.  By December 2003, incident based data collection begins.
<b>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b> 306 students with disabilities were reported as suspended or expelled	
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator A Performance Data:</b> <u>Data:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspension and expulsion data was taken from Federal Table 5, Section B, Page 3 (of 4).</li> <li>These data are deeply flawed, due to collection errors described in the introduction to this report.</li> <li>In the future, the OSE/EIS will collect these data on an incident basis.</li> </ul> <u>Policy:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Michigan Revised Rules for Special Education and the Michigan School Code are relatively silent on detailed provisions regarding suspension for students with disabilities. Typically, general discipline procedures are provided in state law and policy with the clause that they are to be implemented without violating any due process provisions under state or federal law for special education students. Since state law and policy addressing discipline and special education are scant, the resulting guidance from the state is for discipline implemented per general state procedures without violating the federal regulations for the IDEA at 34 CFR §§300.519 et seq.</li> <li>Consistent with findings of the most recent Government Accounting Office study (Student Discipline: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, January 2001) LEA policies and procedures may differ from federal regulations, and their connection with due process rights often raise significant issues requiring technical assistance for the appropriate administration of discipline.</li> <li>In general, it is the position of the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services that positive behavior support (PBS) approaches be used if at all possible. This position is</li> </ul>	

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

supported by Michigan's State Improvement Grant (SIG).

- Also note that other connections to discipline are mentioned in this report in sections addressing the provision of alternative education, a topic frequently cast in the context of discipline issues.

Key provisions in state law and policy are:

School Code, 380.1311 – Covers: (1) suspension/expulsion for gross misdemeanor or persistent disobedience. “If there is reasonable cause to believe that the pupil is handicapped, and the school district has not evaluated the pupil in accordance with rules of the state board to determine if the student is handicapped, the pupil shall be evaluated immediately by the intermediate school district of which the school district is constituent in accordance with section 1711”; (2) provisions for weapons, arson and criminal sexual conduct, (3) suspension/expulsion is from all schools in the state for behavior related to (2), (4) referral to county social services or community health for behavior related to (2), (5) petition to reinstate after expulsion for behavior related to (2), (9 & 10) enrollment in alternative education. There is no mention of disability except for (8) which states “This section does not diminish the due process rights under federal law of a pupil who has been determined to be eligible for special education programs and services”.

School Code, 380.1311a – Contains parallel language covering physical or verbal assault (as defined by the district). (8) this section is identical to (8) given above for 380.1311.

School Code, 380.1311g – Describes students served by a strict discipline academy:

(3) A strict discipline academy shall be established under sections 1311b to 1311l specifically for enrolling 1 or more of the following types of pupils:

(a) Pupils placed in the strict discipline academy by a court or by the family independence agency or a county juvenile agency under the direction of a court.

(b) Pupils who have been expelled under section 1311(2).

(c) Pupils who have been expelled under section 1311a or another provision of this act.

(d) Other expelled pupils referred to the strict discipline academy by that pupil's school and placed in the strict discipline academy by the pupil's parent or legal guardian.

(4) In addition to the types of pupils specified in section (3), a strict discipline public school academy shall be open for enrollment of a special education pupil who does not meet the requirements of subsection (3) if the special education pupil's individualized educational planning committee recommends that the special education pupil be placed in the strict discipline public school academy.

**Enter the percentage of the total performance goals established for students with disabilities that are consistent with those for nondisabled students. \_\_\_\_\_ 100 %**

TABLE 1A

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services**

**Overarching Questions**

SY: 2000-2001

State: Michigan

Assessment Questions	Totals
<p>1. At the grade or age levels tested, as shown on Table 1B, how many students with disabilities participated in the <u>general</u> assessment for the school year reported? (<b><i>Unduplicated Count</i></b>)</p> <p>The data for the general state assessment, the MEAP (Michigan Educational Assessment Program), is not easy to get from the MEAP Office. MEAP is in the Department of Treasury, and the Office of Special Education and Early intervention is in the Department of Education.</p> <p>There was an agreement made in 1999 with the MEAP office that in addition to the regular MEAP reports that are generated for the state summary reports, the MEAP contractor would also produce three additional reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students participating in the MEAP by each content area and grade assessed,</li> <li>• All students participating in the MEAP except for special education students, and</li> <li>• All special education students participating in the MEAP by each content area and grade assessed.</li> </ul> <p>The additional reports are produced later than the regular MEAP summary reports. The MEAP office is not producing grade 11 reports until the entire cohort graduates due to the fact that students in grades 10, 11, and 12 can take and re-take the grade 11 assessment. For this reason cohort reports by graduating class are now what the MEAP office produces for their high school summary reports. When the MEAP office designed the database for the MEAP high school assessments they did not include the field that identifies the student as being a student receiving special education services; therefore, no high school reports disaggregated by special education are being produced. This issue is being addressed. Through the development of an interagency agreement.</p> <p>The 1999 and the 2000 reports were received for the elementary and middle school grades, with the exception of grade 7 reading or mathematics special education summary reports. Those reports will be forwarded to the OSEP as soon as they are released to us. In addition, the production of the 2001 reports are not accessible as a result of issues unrelated to OES/EIS: an investigation of inappropriate practices and the appointment of a new MEAP supervisor and a new Director of the Michigan Merit Award and MEAP. The new MEAP leadership supports getting the MDE the reports in a timely manner, and the reports will also be posted on the Department of Treasury web site at <a href="http://www.michigan.gov/meritaward">www.michigan.gov/meritaward</a> along with the general MEAP state summaries.</p>	<p>Grade 4 Reading – 8380 Grade 4 Mathematics- 8768</p> <p>Grade 5 Science – 10090 Grade 5 Social studies – 9909 Grade 5 Writing – 9462</p> <p>Grade 7 Reading – NA* Grade 7 Mathematics – NA *</p> <p>Grade 8 Science – 10189 Grade 8 Writing – 9879 Grade 8 Social Studies – 10171</p> <p>Grade 11 Reading – NA* Grade 11 Mathematics – NA* Grade 11 Science – NA* Grade 11 Social Studies – NA*</p> <p>NA = Not Available</p>

TABLE 1A

Assessment Questions	Totals
<p>2. At the grade or age levels tested, as shown on Table 1C, how many students participated in the <u>alternate</u> assessment for the school year reported? (<i>Unduplicated Count</i>)</p>	<p>MI-Access, Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program, just went through the standard setting process in April 2002. Scanning, scoring and production of reports for will begin after the State Superintendent of Public Instruction approves the "cut scores" for the three performance categories June 6, 2002. Results will be disseminated at the state and district level in August 2002.</p>
<p>3. At the grade or age levels tested, as shown on Tables 1B and 1C, how many students were provided accommodations or modifications in either assessment measure? (<i>Unduplicated Count</i>)</p> <p><b>Michigan Educational Assessment Program</b>  The general state assessment, MEAP, has a bubble on the student scan sheet, which is supposed to be filled in by the school if assessment accommodations are used. At this time a standing report is not produced of the number of students using assessment accommodations for each of the content areas, by grade. The production of this report is being negotiated with the MEAP office.</p> <p>Please note that the MEAP office is in the Michigan Department of Treasury, not the Michigan Department of Education, therefore the MDE does not have direct control of the reports that are produced by the MEAP office. The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention (OSE/EIS) continues to develop a relationship with the MEAP office in order to assure compliance with the federal state assessment reporting requirements.</p> <p><b>MI-Access, Michigan's Alternate Assessment Program</b>  The number of students using assessment accommodations for the MI-Access Participation assessment is not collected because any accommodation, assistive or adaptive aids are permitted during the assessment.</p> <p>The MI-Access Supported Independence assessment uses a standardized scoring guide that identifies the levels of allowable assistance at specific ages. (See formal BPR submission copy for the (#2 purple sheet) MI-Access Scoring Guides within training packet envelope of green attachment packet for Section 1.1)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>4. Do the totals shown for questions 1 and 2 include all students who were provided accommodations or modifications in the assessment? If yes, enter a zero in the cell to the right. If no, provide the number of students who were provided accommodations or modifications in the assessments and were <u>not</u> included Table 1B or Table 1C. (<i>Unduplicated Count</i>)</p> <p>As requested by the OSE/EIS the MEAP office, for the most part, produces additional reports to comply with federal reporting requirements. The reports are disaggregated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students</li> <li>• All but special education students</li> <li>• Just special education students</li> </ul>	<p>Zero</p>

TABLE 1A

Assessment Questions	Totals
<p>The above summary reports are produced to include all students who participate in each of the assessments. Please note that the school <i>had</i> the option of excluding scores of students receiving special education services who participated in the 2000/2001 MEAP assessments for students who met the criteria of receiving the majority of their reading/English language arts instruction from special education programs and services.</p> <p>The option to exclude student scores from the state, district and school summary reports is being phased out. Starting in the 2002/2003 school year this option will no longer be available. All students who participate in one or more of the MEAP assessments will be included in the school, district and state summary reports if the identity of individual students is not compromised.</p>	
<p>5. At the grade or age levels tested, as shown on Tables 1B and 1C, did <u>ALL</u> students with disabilities participate in at least one assessment measure? If yes, enter a zero in the cell to the right. If no, enter, in the cell to the right, the total number of students who did not participate.</p> <p>If a total is entered in the cell to the right, what is the State's plan for including the participation of these students in future assessments?</p> <p><b>Response (If applicable):</b></p> <p>During the 2000/2001 school year the state had a policy in place that allowed parent exemptions from the general state assessments (MEAP). A new policy has been <i>adopted</i> by the Michigan State Board of Education requiring districts to ensure that all student are assessed with the appropriate state assessment in the Michigan Educational Assessment System (see attached policy). The three state assessments are the MEAP, MI-Access for students receiving special education services or ELL-Access for English language learners. As a result, not all special education students are participating in state assessment.</p>	

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services on General Assessments**

SY: 2000-2001

State: Michigan

General Assessment											
Grade <u>X</u>	Age _____	Content Area: <b>Reading</b> Grade 4 N = 8380					Content Area: <b>Mathematics</b> Grade 4 N = 8768				
		Satisfactory	Moderate	Low	_____	_____	Satisfactory	Moderate	Low	_____	_____
		No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	Proficiency Level.	Proficiency Level
1	6 Yrs										
2	7 Yrs										
3	8 Yrs										
4	9 Yrs	1734 20.7%	1885 22.5%	4768 56.9%			2534 28.9%	2201 25.1%	4033 46.9%		
5	10 Yrs										
6	11 Yrs										
7	12 Yrs	NA	NA	NA			NA	NA	NA		
8	13 Yrs										
9	14 Yrs										
10	15 Yrs										
11	16 Yrs	NA	NA	NA			NA	NA	NA		

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services on General Assessments**

SY: 2000-2001

State: Michigan

General Assessment											
Grade <u>X</u>	Age _____	Content Area: <b>Writing</b> Grade 5 N = 9462 Grade 8 N = 9879					Content Area: <b>Science</b> Grade 5 N = 10090 Grade 8 N = 10189				
		Proficient	Not Yet Proficient	_____	_____	_____	Proficient	Novice	Not Yet Novice	_____	_____
		No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level
1	7 Yrs										
2	8 Yrs										
3	9 Yrs										
4	10 Yrs										
5	11 Yrs	2470 26.1%	6992 73.9%				1412 14%	5450 54%	3228 32%		
6	12 Yrs										
7	13 Yrs										
8	14 Yrs	2588 26.2%	7291 73.8%				275 2.8%	3230 31.7%	6694 65.7		
9	15 Yrs										
10	16 Yrs										

11	17 Yrs	Not Available	Not Available				Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	
----	--------	---------------	---------------	--	--	--	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	--



**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services on General Assessments**

SY: 2000-2001

State: Michigan

General Assessment											
Grade	Age	Content Area: <b>Social Studies</b>				Content Area:					
		Grade 5 N = 9909 Grade 8 N = 10171									
		Level 1 Exceeds Michigan Standards	Level 2 Met Michigan Standards	Level 3 Basic Level	Level 4 Apprentice	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level.	Proficiency Level
		No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed
1	7 Yrs										
2	8 Yrs										
3	9 Yrs										
4	10 Yrs										
5	11 Yrs	20 .2%	406 4.1%	1675 16.9%	7808 78.8						
6	12 Yrs										
7	13 Yrs										
8	14 Yrs	51 .5%	437 4.3%	1282 12.6%	8411 82.7%						
9	15 Yrs										
10	16 Yrs										
11	17 Yrs	NA	NA	NA	NA						

If ALL information found in Table 1B is being reported as part of the State’s “report to the public” (34 CFR §300.139(b)), then Table 1B is NOT required. Instead, submit a copy of the State’s “report to the public” with the Biennial Performance Report and indicate, in the row labeled Explanation/Discussion in Table 1, where the information found in Table 1B can be located in the State’s “report to the public”.

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services on Alternate Assessments**

SY: 2000-2001

State: Michigan

Alternate Assessment											
Grade _____	Age <u>X</u>	Content Area: MI-Access Participation (Students with Severe Cognitive Impairment or those who function as if they have such impairment)					Content Area: MI-Access Supported Independence (Students with Moderate Cognitive Impairment or those who function as if they have such impairment)				
		Surpassed Performance Standard	Attained Performance Standard	Emerging Toward Performance Standard	_____ Proficiency Level	_____ Proficiency Level	Surpassed Performance Standard	Attained Performance Standard	Emerging Toward Performance Standard	_____ Proficiency Level	_____ Proficiency Level
		No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed
1	7 Yrs										
2	8 Yrs										
3	9 Yrs	*	*	*			*	*	*		
4	10 Yrs	*	*	*			*	*	*		
5	11 Yrs										
6	12 Yrs										
7	13 Yrs	*	*	*			*	*	*		
8	14 Yrs	*	*	*			*	*	*		
9	15 Yrs										
11	17 Yrs	*	*	*			*	*	*		
11	18 Yrs	*	*	*			*	*	*		

\* 2001/2002 results will be reported in August 2002.

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Participation in/Performance of Students Receiving Special Education Services on Alternate Assessments**

SY: 2000-2001

State: Michigan

Alternate Assessment											
Grade <u>X</u>	Age _____	Content Area: MI-Access Determined by IEP Team (not taking any MEAP assessments, MI-Access Participation or MI-Access Supported Independence)					Content Area:				
			Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level	Surpassed Performance Standard	Attained Performance Standard	Emerging Toward Performance Standard	Proficiency Level	Proficiency Level
		No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed	No. of Students Assessed
2	8 Yrs										
3	9 Yrs										
4	10 Yrs	*									
5	11 Yrs	*									
6	12 Yrs										
7	13 Yrs	*									
8	14 Yrs	*									
9	15 Yrs										
11	17 Yrs	*									

\* 2001/2002 results will be reported in August 2002. The IEP Team determines the specific assessment administered until development of all levels of the state alternative assessments are completed. The various levels of the alternate assessments are being developed in phases. All phases will be completed by 2005.

## Step 5:

1. Does the State have policy that allows a parent to “exempt” his/her child from State or district-wide assessments?

The Michigan State Board of Education approved the Michigan Educational Assessment System (MEAS) October 2001 (See attachment 1). This policy states districts must ensure that all students participate in the MEAS using the appropriate assessment. Prior to the 2001/2002 school year, parents of students with disabilities and Limited English Proficient students had the option to exempt their child from the state assessments. This is no longer a state policy. The state however cannot prevent parents from refusing to have their child participate in the state assessment system.

2. When statistically sound, has the State defined performance levels for the Alternate Assessment?

Yes. MI-Access has defined three categories of performance: Surpassed the Performance Standard, Attained the Performance Standard, and Emerging Toward the Performance Standard.

3. Does a single alternate assessment represent multiple content areas, or are there separate alternate assessments for each content area?

The Phase 1 MI-Access assessments, Participation and Supported Independence, cover multiple content areas. They are developed for ages comparable to the general state assessment grades assessed (ages 9, 10, 13, 14, 17 and 18). Ages 11 and 12 will be in place by the 2005/2006 school year. MI-Access Participation is designed for students with severe cognitive impairment or those who function as if they have such impairment. Supported Independence is designed for students with moderate cognitive impairment or those who function as if they have such impairment. The assessment design for both of these assessments does not include sufficient numbers of “items” to report results by specific content areas. Consequently, MI-Access results are reported by broad areas called performance expectations.

The Phase 2 MI-Access assessments are in the process of being developed for students for whom the MEAP, MEAP with assessment accommodations, MI-Access Participation or MI-Access Supported Independence are not appropriate. These assessments will be developed at the same grade levels as the general state assessment (grades 3,4, 5, 6 7, 8, and 11). There will be multiple Phase 2 assessments for IEP Teams to choose from. There will be MI-Access English Language Arts/Reading, MI-Access Mathematics, and MI-Access Functional Independence assessments. Also, starting in the 2007/2008 school year there will be a MI-Access science assessment. By including multiple assessment options it provides IEP Teams with appropriate options for all students with disabilities.

4. How does the exclusion/exemption rate for students with disabilities compare to that for students who are non-disabled?

Since the state board policy does not provide for parent exemption this data is not available. For the 2001/2002 school year the MEAP and MI-Access student scan sheets did not include a “Parent Exempt” bubble. If a parent refuses to have his/her child assessed the “Not Tested” bubble is filled in. This bubble also is filled in when a child is absent, or the student is randomly marking answers on the scan sheet.

5. How does the state identify students with disabilities who are participating in statewide assessments?

A scan form should be completed for all public school students in Michigan, either a MEAP or a MI-Access scan document. MI-Access will produce participation rate reports in order to calculate the number of students participating in alternate assessment. Each district and school building will receive these reports. The Michigan Department of Education will also provide the Michigan Department of Treasury (where the general state assessment is housed) the data in electronic format: (1) a total percentage of students participating in state assessment calculated (2) using the MI-Access report and the MEAP reports.

Step 6:

1. Copy of the State Guidelines for participation in alternate assessment.

Michigan’s guidelines for participation in state assessment are disseminated in multiple ways. The guidelines, Determining Levels of independence, are included in the MI-Access training materials that are disseminated statewide yearly (see attachment 2). The guidelines provide IEP teams with key questions that should be addressed related to statewide assessment. In addition to the training packet, the document is posted in the special education section of the MDE web site ([www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde)), included in the bimonthly newsletter called *The Assist*, included in the CD-ROM version of the MI-Access Coordinator/Administration Manual, and information is included in the MI-Access PREVIEW videotape. Annual MI-Access conferences are conducted to provide training to district staff, parents and pre-service institutes of higher education on how to use the guidelines.

2. Enclosed are the 2000/2001 MEAP state level reports. The format for the district and school summary reports is the same. Enclosed is a MEAP Handbook that provides detailed information on the reports provided districts. MI-Access, Michigan’s Alternate Assessment Program, will send the 2001/2002 reports to districts in August 2002.

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 1:</b> Michigan Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) Result Area: <b>Students with disabilities reach challenging educational standards.</b>  The State of Michigan Board of Education priority: Raise Student Achievement in Michigan.	
<b>Goal 1/Indicator A: (SECTION 1.2 DROP OUT RATES)</b> <b>Indicator of success:</b> Drop out rates for students with disabilities decrease. *	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator A:</b>  <u>Performance target:</u> By December 2005, the drop out rate data for students with disabilities will be comparable to general education drop out rate data.  <u>Benchmarks:</u>  By December 2002, Education Yes! will include these data as part of the accreditation system for schools.  By May 2003, the CIMP Steering Committee will have set strategic directives for this goal.  By December 2003, drop out data will be reported through MI-CIS data portraits for every school district.  By December 2003, the consistency of reporting exit data across the state will be audited/monitored.
<b>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b> 31.5% of students with disabilities are reported as dropouts	
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator A Performance Data:</b>  <u>Data:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a one-year calculation based on Federal table 4, Section B, page 13 (of 14), looking at students with disabilities aged 16 through 22 who are reported as dropouts.</li> <li>The MDE's special education compliance database is undergoing revision. In the future we will be able to track most students over time through the use of a statewide Student Unique Identifier, allowing for a more accurate calculation. Currently, there are students in the "Moved, Not known to be continuing" category that cannot be tracked over time and across the state. They are not counted as dropouts in this calculation. The new data system will allow for more accurate reporting on the status of those students.</li> <li>The calculation differs from the methodology used in general education. The Standard and Poor's Statewide Insights document reports "Although different states calculate dropout rates differently, Michigan's dropout formula is so different that the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) does not compare Michigan's dropout data with the rest of the nation's." (Pg. 33). Currently, a complex retention rate calculation is used.</li> </ul> <u>Policy:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Michigan School Code and state policy contains a preference for the "normal" and "alternative" (as opposed to "adult") education secondary school sequence for school age dropouts.</li> <li>School age dropouts must be out of school for one year before enrollment is allowed in adult education</li> <li>School age dropouts under age 16 cannot be claimed for state school aid when attending adult education programs.</li> <li>Students who have dropped out may enroll without resident district permission in a district other than the district of residence that operates alternative education programs for more than 1 district.</li> <li>The school code requires that each district or public school academy submit data needed to calculate annual dropout rates.</li> </ul>	

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

- Alternative education most often cited in law in conjunction with suspension/expulsion. State must inventory alternative education options across districts and provide technical assistance. Some additional flexibility in statute for waiving minimum days/hours of instruction in alternative education programs.
- Education YES! - The New Michigan State Board of Education Standards-based Accreditation System for Schools  
Dropout rates are a direct factor used in determining a rating score for each school.  
All Michigan high school students will have a 4-year education and employment development plan leading them to being prepared for success.
- Michigan Department of Career Development  
Supports for dropouts are also available through the Michigan Department of Career Development (MDCD), a state agency that is distinct from the Michigan Department of Education. MDCD must make available, under Section 121 of the Workforce Investment Act Of 1998 (P.L. 105-220), a listing of all school dropout, postsecondary, and adult programs assisted under the Perkins Act. Many of the resources and services provided through MDCD and Michigan Rehabilitation Services (MRS) can be accessed at the more than 100 Michigan Works! service centers throughout the state.
- Michigan Departments of Education and Career Development/Rehabilitation Services Cash-Match Programs  
There are approximately 70 jointly funded and operated programs implemented by school districts and the Michigan Rehabilitation Services office of MDCD under cash-match grants.

**Enter the percentage of the total performance goals established for students with disabilities that are consistent with those for nondisabled students. \_\_\_\_\_100\_\_\_\_\_ %**



## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

<b>Goal 1:</b> Michigan Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) Result Area: <b>Students with disabilities reach challenging educational standards.</b>  The State of Michigan Board of Education priority: Raise Student Achievement in Michigan.	
<b>Goal 1/Indicator A: (SECTION 1.3 GRADUATION RATES)</b> Indicator of success:  Graduation rates for students with disabilities increase *	<b>Performance Targets/Benchmarks for Goal 1/Indicator A:</b>  <u>Performance target:</u>  By December 2005, 80% of students with disabilities will graduate from high school.  By December 2005, data collection improvements phased in over a four-year period will result in improved methodology for the calculation of graduation rates.  <u>Benchmarks:</u>  By December 2002, Education Yes! will include these data as part of the accreditation system for schools.  By May 2003, the CIMP Steering Committee will have set strategic directives for this goal.  By December 2003, graduation rates will be reported through MI-CIS data portraits for every school district.
<b>Performance Data for Goal 1/Indicator A: 2000-2001</b> 53.96% of students with disabilities (aged 18 and 19 years) are reported to graduate.	
<b>Explanation/Discussion for Goal 1/Indicator A Performance Data:</b> <u>Data:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using a one-year calculation, taking data from Federal Table 4 Section B, Page 13 (of 14). Divide the number of graduations by the number of exits to get graduation rate. Used 18 and 19 year olds, although we do not know the mix of high school juniors and seniors in the breakdown.</li> <li>Comparison data for general education are problematic. Standard and Poor's Statewide Insights reports "Like the dropout rate, concerns exist over the method the state [Michigan] uses to calculate graduation rates".</li> <li>In special education data (December 1), we have an age data element, but not grade. So we are left with an estimate of grade which makes the four-year method difficult. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Even in using a one-year method, we have to make an age estimate for which students are about to graduate.</li> <li>Our annual snapshot counts do not track children from year to year. We do get a count of the number of children that left in the last year, but we have an incomplete record of transfers into another district or state.</li> <li>Even when we are able to track special education children from year to year, we have no mechanism for tracking children who leave special education and then graduate from general education. The 'no longer special education' category is excluded from the graduation rate.</li> <li>The Single Record Student Database (general education data collection system) collects exit reason data for all students. Their set of codes is much larger, including many levels of graduation and certificates.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

**Policy:**

- In regard to graduation standards, Michigan is a local control state, with over 550 locally elected school boards, 57 Intermediate School Boards (ISD), and 191 charter school boards. In general, the state attempts to influence school performance by providing incentives for bottom-line performance on statewide testing which is aligned with Michigan Curriculum Framework Standards/Benchmarks and other performance indicators, while avoiding intrusion in local decisions regarding curriculum and instruction. Requirements vary dramatically.
- The State of Michigan does not:
  - grant a diploma leaving that authority and responsibility to local education agencies/boards (exception: State School for the Deaf)
  - grant various certificates of attainment that are alternatives to a regular diploma, e.g., certificates of attendance or completion
  - have a state-standardized test students must pass in order to graduate (e.g., Regents Test in NY)
  - recognize a GED as equivalent to a regular diploma, i.e., attainment of a GED does not terminate a student's right to a FAPE for the purposes of pursuing a regular diploma; however GED's are accepted for college admission
- State education statutes and regulations do assign local boards of education the authority and responsibility to:
  - determine curriculum that is reasonably within a broadly based state curriculum framework, i.e., there is no single detailed and mandated state curriculum for students in general or special education
  - at local board's discretion, grant diplomas strictly according to locally determined general standards
  - Alternatively, at a local board's discretion, approve all local curricula as a single combined "general" curriculum for graduation. In this case, by local definition, all students regardless of level of functioning would be "in the general curriculum" or would require a subjective distinction between what is 'general' and 'special' curriculum
  - at local boards' discretion, approve local curricular elements covering all students via separate "general" and "special" curricula
  - at the local board's discretion, also allow graduation by standards outlined on an IEP as determined by an IEPT
  - at local board's discretion, grant various certificates of attainment that are not a regular diploma
- Graduation with a regular diploma may be indicative of local operational procedures and definitions, rather than measures of attainment.
- Transition is a uniquely significant issue in Michigan that may impact graduation. Nationally, Michigan has the broadest age range for special education, providing a FAPE to eligible students who are age 25 or less at the beginning of the school year.
  - Students/parents may seek to delay completion of graduation requirements in order to continue mandated services via an IEP. This in turn may delay pursuing services from other community agencies.
  - "Late completers" may present complications in determining yearly graduation rates

**Enter the percentage of the total performance goals established for students with disabilities that are consistent with those for nondisabled students. \_\_\_\_\_100\_\_ %**

## Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

### Performance Data: 2000-2001

See attached tables.

### Disproportionality Performance Targets/Benchmarks:

#### Performance Targets:

By December 2005, no cell value in the e-measure disability versus ethnicity or ethnicity versus placement will be within the allowed upper e-measure.

By December 2005, no cell value in the Odds Ratio disability versus ethnicity or ethnicity versus placement will exceed 1.5.

#### Benchmarks:

By December 2003, the disproportionality areas of concern will be studied on a district-by-district basis. Results will be reported to the CIMP Steering Committee.

By December 2004, guidance and technical assistance will be provided to districts where concerns arise from the analysis.

### Explanation/Discussion for Disproportionality Data:

#### Data:

Guidance regarding the calculations to be used for analysis of disproportionality was provided by the OSEP at the spring data conference. Daniel Reschly recommended the use of two distinct indices when measuring disproportionality: 1.) Composition Index and 2.) Risk Index. The problem with the Composition and Risk indices, in isolation, is that they do not provide a measure to know if the index is unacceptable. In the data presented in the attached tables, values are highlighted that appear to be out of line. Two additional measures were used: 1.) Ratio. A measure is unacceptable if the ratio of Special Education to General Education value is more than 1.5, and 2.) E-measure. This is a statistical measure used in a California court (Larry P e-formula calculation) about ethnic group representation. These calculations were used to examine the proportionality of students in special education by ethnicity, ethnicity by disability label, and ethnicity by placement.

#### Discussion:

- Overall, the ethnic composition of students in special education is proportionate with the general education population. However there are pockets of concern. African-American students are over-represented within the mental retardation category. Asian students are over-represented in the areas of Autism and Speech. Whites are over-represented in the Orthopedic category (see attached Table 7).
- When examining the placement of students with disabilities by ethnicity, concerns are again raised for African-American students. African-American students are over-represented in self-contained classrooms. In Michigan, this means that the student is in a separate special education classroom within a general education school for at least 60% of the day (no more than 40% of the day in a general education classroom). Whites are over-represented in the two categories indicating placement in general education for at least 40% of the day. (see attached Table 13).
- These issues will be studied with results available in December 2003. The MDE, OSE/EIS will begin with a district by district analysis of these data, using the same calculations as in this report. We suspect the disproportionality issues may be geographic and would like to understand whether this is a service provision issue, an identification issue, or a combination of the two.

TABLE 1

State of \_\_\_\_\_

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.

Table 1: California E-Formula Calculation for General Education versus Special Education

	Gen Ed Frequency	Percent	Sp Ed Frequency	Percent	Maximum allowed e-formula
Native American	17,179	1.03%	1,830	0.91%	3.40%
Asian	30,815	1.85%	4,332	2.16%	3.91%
Black	315,020	18.88%	39,081	19.45%	21.08%
Hispanic	57,481	3.45%	5,663	2.82%	5.91%
White	1,247,972	74.80%	150,018	74.66%	77.02%
Total	1,668,467	100.00%	200,924	100.00%	

Table 2: Ethnic Group by Disability – Raw Counts

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Mental Retardation	204	399	8,150	588	14,741	24,082
Hearing Impaired	22	106	567	94	2,209	2,998
Speech	285	1,110	6,325	967	31,046	39,733
Visual Impaired	6	36	203	16	609	870
Emotionally Impaired	227	305	3,717	382	14,364	18,995
Orthopedic Impaired	126	332	1,398	242	10,834	12,932
Learning Disabled	911	1,776	17,414	3,243	70,998	94,342
Multihandicapped	22	75	589	71	2,080	2,837
Autistic Impaired	27	190	708	58	3,086	4,069
Developmental Delay	0	3	10	2	51	66
Total	1,830	4,332	39,081	5,663	150,018	200,924
State	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Gen Ed Population	17,179	30,815	315,020	57,481	1,247,972	1,668,467

**Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Goals and Indicators**

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

**Table 3: Individual Risk Calculation – Disability by Ethnicity as Percentage of General Education Population**

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Mental Retardation	1.19%	1.29%	2.59%	1.02%	1.18%	1.44%
Hearing Impaired	0.13%	0.34%	0.18%	0.16%	0.18%	0.18%
Speech	1.66%	3.60%	2.01%	1.68%	2.49%	2.38%
Visual Impaired	0.03%	0.12%	0.06%	0.03%	0.05%	0.05%
Emotionally Impaired	1.32%	0.99%	1.18%	0.66%	1.15%	1.14%
Orthopedic Impaired	0.73%	1.08%	0.44%	0.42%	0.87%	0.78%
Learning Disabled	5.30%	5.76%	5.53%	5.64%	5.69%	5.65%
Multihandicapped	0.13%	0.24%	0.19%	0.12%	0.17%	0.17%
Autistic Impaired	0.16%	0.62%	0.22%	0.10%	0.25%	0.24%
Developmental Delay	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total	10.65%	14.06%	12.41%	9.85%	12.02%	12.04%
State	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Gen Ed Population	17,179	30,815	315,020	57,481	1,247,972	1,668,467

**Table 4: Group Composition – Disability Percentage by Ethnicity**

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Mental Retardation	0.85%	1.66%	33.84%	2.44%	61.21%	100.00%
Hearing Impaired	0.73%	3.54%	18.91%	3.14%	73.68%	100.00%
Speech	0.72%	2.79%	15.92%	2.43%	78.14%	100.00%
Visual Impaired	0.69%	4.14%	23.33%	1.84%	70.00%	100.00%
Emotionally Impaired	1.20%	1.61%	19.57%	2.01%	75.62%	100.00%
Orthopedic Impaired	0.97%	2.57%	10.81%	1.87%	83.78%	100.00%
Learning Disabled	0.97%	1.88%	18.46%	3.44%	75.26%	100.00%
Multihandicapped	0.78%	2.64%	20.76%	2.50%	73.32%	100.00%
Autistic Impaired	0.66%	4.67%	17.40%	1.43%	75.84%	100.00%
Developmental Delay	0.00%	4.55%	15.15%	3.03%	77.27%	100.00%
Total	0.91%	2.16%	19.45%	2.82%	74.66%	100.00%

TABLE 1

State of \_\_\_\_\_

**Biennial Performance Report  
Performance Goals and Indicators**

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

**Table 5: Odds Ratio – Disability by Ethnicity Cells as Percentage of Total Special Education Population\***

(Shaded areas indicate a value >1.5 and should be examined)

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Mental Retardation	0.82	0.90	1.79	0.71	0.82	1.00
Hearing Impaired	0.71	1.91	1.00	0.91	0.99	1.00
Speech	0.70	1.51	0.84	0.71	1.04	1.00
Visual Impaired	0.67	2.24	1.24	0.53	0.94	1.00
Emotionally Impaired	1.16	0.87	1.04	0.58	1.01	1.00
Orthopedic Impaired	0.95	1.39	0.57	0.54	1.12	1.00
Learning Disabled	0.94	1.02	0.98	1.00	1.01	1.00
Multihandicapped	0.75	1.43	1.10	0.73	0.98	1.00
Autistic Impaired	0.64	2.53	0.92	0.41	1.01	1.00
Developmental Delay	0.00	2.46	0.80	0.88	1.03	1.00
Total	0.88	1.17	1.03	0.82	1.00	1.00
State	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Gen Ed Population	17,179	30,815	315,020	57,481	1,247,972	1,668,467

\*Validity greater with larger n.

TABLE 1

State of \_\_\_\_\_

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.

Table 6: E-Formula -- Upper Percent Allowed for Each Cell\*

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Mental Retardation	1.68%	2.72%	21.68%	4.64%	80.35%	24,082
Hearing Impaired	2.88%	4.33%	26.81%	6.83%	90.53%	2,998
Speech	1.54%	2.53%	21.06%	4.38%	79.12%	39,733
Visual Impaired	4.47%	6.45%	33.60%	9.74%	104.01%	870
Emotionally Impaired	1.77%	2.83%	22.03%	4.79%	81.05%	18,995
Orthopedic Impaired	1.92%	3.04%	22.70%	5.08%	82.37%	12,932
Learning Disabled	1.36%	2.29%	20.29%	4.05%	77.60%	94,342
Multihandicapped	2.93%	4.40%	27.03%	6.93%	90.97%	2,837
Autistic Impaired	2.62%	3.98%	25.69%	6.35%	88.30%	4,069
Developmental Delay	13.52%	18.57%	72.32%	26.29%	180.86%	66
Total	1.26%	2.15%	19.85%	3.86%	76.72%	200,924
State	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Gen Ed Population	1.03%	1.85%	18.88%	3.45%	74.80%	100.00%

\* Validity greater with smaller n.

Table 7: Group Composition Compared with E-Formula. Table 4 Compared to Table 6  
(Shading Indicates positive number -- over-representation by e-formula comparison)

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Mental Retardation	-0.84%	-1.07%	12.16%	-2.20%	-19.14%	100.00%
Hearing Impaired	-2.15%	-0.79%	-7.90%	-3.70%	-16.85%	100.00%
Speech	-0.82%	0.27%	-5.14%	-1.94%	-0.98%	100.00%
Visual Impaired	-3.78%	-2.32%	-10.27%	-7.90%	-34.01%	100.00%
Emotionally Impaired	-0.57%	-1.23%	-2.46%	-2.78%	-5.43%	100.00%
Orthopedic Impaired	-0.95%	-0.47%	-11.89%	-3.21%	1.40%	100.00%
Learning Disabled	-0.39%	-0.41%	-1.84%	-0.61%	-2.35%	100.00%
Multihandicapped	-2.16%	-1.75%	-6.27%	-4.43%	-17.66%	100.00%
Autistic Impaired	-1.96%	0.69%	-8.29%	-4.93%	-12.46%	100.00%
Developmental Delay	-13.52%	-14.03%	-57.16%	-23.26%	-103.58%	100.00%
Total	-0.35%	0.10%	-0.40%	-1.04%	-2.06%	100.00%

TABLE 1

State of \_\_\_\_\_

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.

Table 8: Special Education Placement by Ethnicity – Raw Count

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Spec Ed 1-21%	754	2,526	11,717	2,180	71,886	89,063
Spec Ed 21-60%	631	1,018	7,082	1,816	46,679	57,226
Spec Ed 60-80%	138	221	3,013	500	10,475	14,347
Spec Ed 80-100%	219	441	15,801	1,009	14,814	32,284
Spec Ed Building	75	115	1,190	133	5,472	6,985
Public Residential	9	6	85	6	235	341
Private Residential	2	2	118	13	255	390
Hospital/Homebound	2	3	75	6	202	288
Total	1,830	4,332	39,081	5,663	150,018	200,924
State	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Gen Ed Population	17,179	30,815	315,020	57,481	1,247,972	1,668,467

Table 9: Individual Risk Calculation – Placement by Ethnicity as Percentage of General Education Population

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Spec Ed 1-21%	4.39%	8.20%	3.72%	3.79%	5.76%	5.34%
Spec Ed 21-60%	3.67%	3.30%	2.25%	3.16%	3.74%	3.43%
Spec Ed 60-80%	0.80%	0.72%	0.96%	0.87%	0.84%	0.86%
Spec Ed 80-100%	1.27%	1.43%	5.02%	1.76%	1.19%	1.93%
Spec Ed Building	0.44%	0.37%	0.38%	0.23%	0.44%	0.42%
Public Residential	0.05%	0.02%	0.03%	0.01%	0.02%	0.02%
Private Residential	0.01%	0.01%	0.04%	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%
Hospital/Homebound	0.01%	0.01%	0.02%	0.01%	0.02%	0.02%
Total	10.65%	14.06%	12.41%	9.85%	12.02%	12.04%
State	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Gen Ed Population	17,179	30,815	315,020	57,481	1,247,972	1,668,467

BPR/SECTION 1/TABLE 1: 1999-2000/2000-2001  
(OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date 05/31/2002)



TABLE 1

State of \_\_\_\_\_

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.

Table 10: Group Composition – Placement Percentage by Ethnicity

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Spec Ed 1-21%	0.85%	2.84%	13.16%	2.45%	80.71%	100.00%
Spec Ed 21-60%	1.10%	1.78%	12.38%	3.17%	81.57%	100.00%
Spec Ed 60-80%	0.96%	1.54%	21.00%	3.49%	73.01%	100.00%
Spec Ed 80-100%	0.68%	1.37%	48.94%	3.13%	45.89%	100.00%
Spec Ed Building	1.07%	1.65%	17.04%	1.90%	78.34%	100.00%
Public Residential	2.64%	1.76%	24.93%	1.76%	68.91%	100.00%
Private Residential	0.51%	0.51%	30.26%	3.33%	65.38%	100.00%
Hospital/Homebound	0.69%	1.04%	26.04%	2.08%	70.14%	100.00%
Total	0.91%	2.16%	19.45%	2.82%	74.66%	100.00%

Table 11: Odds Ratio – Placement by Ethnicity Cells as a Percentage of Total Special Education Population\*

(Shaded areas indicate a value >1.5 and should be examined)

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Spec Ed 1-21%	0.82	1.54	0.70	0.71	1.08	1.00
Spec Ed 21-60%	1.07	0.96	0.66	0.92	1.09	1.00
Spec Ed 60-80%	0.93	0.83	1.11	1.01	0.98	1.00
Spec Ed 80-100%	0.66	0.74	2.59	0.91	0.61	1.00
Spec Ed Building	1.04	0.89	0.90	0.55	1.05	1.00
Public Residential	2.56	0.95	1.32	0.51	0.92	1.00
Private Residential	0.50	0.28	1.60	0.97	0.87	1.00
Hospital/Homebound	0.67	0.56	1.38	0.60	0.94	1.00
Total	0.88	1.17	1.03	0.82	1.00	1.00
State	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Gen Ed Population	17,179	30,815	315,020	57,481	1,247,972	1,668,467

\* Validity greater with large n.

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Performance Goals and Indicators**

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*

TABLE 1

State of \_\_\_\_\_

### Biennial Performance Report Performance Goals and Indicators

Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.

Table 12: E-Formula – Upper Percent Allowed for Each Cell\*

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Spec Ed 1-21%	1.37%	2.30%	20.34%	4.07%	77.68%	89,063
Spec Ed 21-60%	1.45%	2.41%	20.70%	4.22%	78.40%	57,226
Spec Ed 60-80%	1.88%	2.48%	20.89%	4.30%	78.79%	14,347
Spec Ed 80-100%	1.59%	2.60%	21.30%	4.48%	79.59%	32,284
Spec Ed Building	2.24%	3.47%	24.07%	5.67%	85.11%	6,985
Public Residential	6.52%	9.21%	42.39%	13.49%	121.46%	341
Private Residential	6.17%	8.73%	40.86%	12.84%	118.43%	390
Hospital/Homebound	7.01%	9.85%	44.46%	14.38%	125.57%	288
Total	1.26%	2.15%	19.85%	3.86%	76.72%	200,924
State	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Gen Ed Population	1.03%	1.85%	18.88%	3.45%	74.80%	100.00%

\* Validity greater with smaller n.

**Table 13: Group Composition Compared with E-Formula. Table 10 Compared to Table 12.**  
(Shading indicates positive number -- over-representation by e-formula comparison)

	Native American	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Spec Ed 1-21%	-0.52%	0.53%	-7.18%	-1.62%	3.03%	
Spec Ed 21-60%	-0.35%	-0.64%	-8.32%	-1.05%	3.17%	
Spec Ed 60-80%	-0.91%	-0.94%	0.11%	-0.82%	-5.78%	
Spec Ed 80-100%	-0.92%	-1.24%	27.65%	-1.35%	-33.71%	
Spec Ed Building	-1.17%	-1.83%	-7.04%	-3.76%	-6.77%	
Public Residential	-3.88%	-7.45%	-17.46%	-11.74%	-52.54%	
Private Residential	-5.65%	-8.22%	-10.61%	-9.51%	-53.04%	
Hospital/Homebound	-6.31%	-8.81%	-18.42%	-12.30%	-55.43%	
Total	-0.35%	0.01%	-0.40%	-1.04%	-2.06%	

**Biennial Performance Report**  
**Performance Goals and Indicators**

*Note: Indicate with an asterisk (\*) goals and indicators that are the same as the goals and indicators for students who are nondisabled. At a minimum, assessment, dropout rates, and graduation rates are to be addressed.*